DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 500 RC 010 063

AUTHOR Chou, Bih-Er; And Others
TITLE Areal Characteristics and Changing Community Norms.
PUB DATE 1 Sep 77
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, (Madison, Wisconsin, September 1-4, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Age; *Attitudes; Family Income; Grade 10; High School Students; Longitudinal Studies; Occupations; Population Distribution; Population Growth; Rural Areas; Rural Farm Residents; Rural Population; *Rural Youth; *Social Change; State Surveys; *Urbanization; Urban Population; *Values
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania; *Traditionalism

ABSTRACT

Study objectives were to assess actual changes in normative traditionalism which had occurred in a sample of rural Pennsylvania areas and to determine the extent to which the changes in traditionalism were associated with the rurality of these areas. Utilizing a combination of socioeconomic data (census derived) and longitudinal data obtained via an attitude survey of sophomore students, the sample (N=2,601 for 1947 and 5,429 for 1970) consisted of 68 schools located in 45 of the state's 67 counties. Traditionalism was defined operationally as: irregular church attendance; divorce; drinking alcoholic beverages; use of tobacco; card playing; Sunday movies; Sabbath labor; young people loafing uptown; young people staying out late; failure in school; ways young people spend their money; and use of makeup. Independent variables employed were: population size; population density; percent urban population; percent rural farm population; median family income; percent professional, technical, and kindred workers (PTK) and managers, officials, and proprietors (MOP); median education; and median age. Results indicated norms became more permissive re: such aspects of general behavior as irregular church attendance, divorce, drinking, tobacco, card playing, Sunday movies, and Sabbath labor and toward such youth activities as spending money, staying out late, loafing uptown, and the use of makeup (the decline in traditionalism was least likely to occur in areas where the initial level of urbanization was low). (JC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED148500

SEP 1977
ERIC/CRESS
RECEIVED

AREAL CHARACTERISTICS

and

CHANGING COMMUNITY NORMS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bih-Er Chou

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Bih-Er Chou, Donald M. Crider, and Fern K. Willits

The Pennsylvania State University

Presented to the 1977 Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, Madison, Wisconsin, 1-4 September.

CG010063

AREAL CHARACTERISTICS
and
CHANGING COMMUNITY NORMS

The Problem

Few sociologists would challenge the assertion that the American rural sector of society is changing (Copp, 1964; Rogers and Burdge, 1972). Open-country areas are often characterized by increasing population density, a declining emphasis on agriculture as the economic base, shifts in the demographic composition of the population and greater opportunities for participation in the larger society's educational and occupational structures. But, the degree to which these changes have been accompanied by corresponding changes in norms, value systems, and other cultural aspects of society is less well documented. The presumed systemic nature of society would suggest, however, that changes in some parts would be reflected in changes in other components as well (Loomis and Beegle, 1950; Williams, 1970).

The process most often cited as having had the greatest impact for change in rural life in the United States is what has been termed "urbanization." William E. Cole (1958:7) and Nels Anderson (1962) have pointed out that "urbanization" is used to denote much more than a population concentration; it also refers to the spread of urban social structure to the hinterland and urban cultural dominance over the entire society. As part of this process, various empirical findings have indicated that, in general, rural society in the United States has been changing from its historical traditionalism toward more

liberalism or modernism (Grasmick, 1973), and more cosmopolitanism with greater emphasis on secondary relationships (Larson and Rogers, 1964) and rational behavior (Vidich and Bensman, 1958). Other studies have shown that many of the cultural differences between rural and urban lifestyles are associated with socioeconomic, demographic, ecological, and other structural factors (Willits, et al., 1974; Poplin, 1972:216-220; Grasmick, 1973; Van Es and Brown, 1974; Lowe and Peek, 1974). Consequently, it is frequently suggested that the norms of rural communities can be expected to change as the structural urbanization of the area increases and the characteristics historically associated with rural living are altered. Most empirical studies that have dealt with this idea, however, share common limitations. First, they focus primarily on the individual as the unit of analysis, often utilizing personal characteristics of the actors as independent variables to explain differences in rates of change. Thus, they do not directly address the social or contextual effects of change in the area on community norms. Second, those few studies that have used the community or area as the unit of analysis have generally focused on cross-sectional data, contrasting different types of communities at a given point in time rather than examining the same communities across time. Generalizations about change drawn from such data are inferential at best, and may lead to fallacious conclusions (Poplin, 1972; Larson and Rogers, 1964).

This study utilizes longitudinal data to assess change and focuses on the contextual characteristics of the areas as they relate

to traditional norms. Specifically the analysis has two interrelated objectives:

1) To assess the actual changes in normative traditionalism that have occurred in a sample of rural Pennsylvania areas.
2) To determine the extent to which the changes in traditionalism that have occurred are associated with the rurality of the areas as measured by their demographic and socioeconomic characteristics.

The Sample

Research on these problems was made possible by the availability of longitudinal information gathered by The Pennsylvania State University as part of a series of surveys on the attitudes of rural young people. Questionnaire data from these studies provided indices of the traditionalism of the areas. These were combined with information on the social and economic characteristics of the county units to address the objectives of the study.

The original attitude survey, conducted in 1947, collected information from sophomore students in 74 rural Pennsylvania schools. In 1970, the same school districts were resurveyed so that comparable data were collected from sophomore students then residing in the townships and boroughs served by the 1947 schools. Five of the original schools refused to cooperate in the latter survey and two districts had merged with each other. The resulting sample for the present study consisted of 68 schools located in 45 of the state's

67 counties. A total of 2,601 individual student questionnaires were used from the 1947 survey and 5,429 from the 1970 survey.

Measuring the Dependent Variable: Traditional Norms

The problem of measuring "social norms" is a vexing one in that norms, like values, are not concrete and visible entities in the real world. They are abstractions that must be inferred from observable phenomena. The procedure chosen for the present study was to infer the normative stance of an area from a composite or aggregation of the responses of individual residents to questions about what "should" be permitted and/or not criticized (Taheri and Willits, 1975).[1] The attitudinal responses of the high school students surveyed in the longitudinal study described above provided indicators of the normative traditionalism of the areas. While this choice was dictated partially by the availability of appropriate data, the use of adolescent subjects for this purpose is not without rationale. Teenagers in American culture might be expected to know and express the normative position of an area as well as or better than other age groupings. The emphasis on youth in America may mean that their feelings carry more "weight" than would be the case in many other cultural settings. Moreover, adolescents would be expected to have learned the norms of adult behavior as part of their anticipatory socialization. When asked to answer items about what "should" be, they are likely to answer in terms of the standards they have been taught. Previous analysis had shown these young people to be quite

traditional and overwhelmingly accepting of their elders' viewpoints (Chand, et al., 1975). Hence, the adolescent surveys would seem to be an acceptable source for ascertaining the normative traditionalism of the areas studied.

The specific instrument used to measure traditionalism consisted of twelve Likert-type questions which were presented to the subjects in the 1947 survey and again in the 1970 study. Traditionalism was defined operationally as a belief that the following behaviors should be censured or criticized: 1) irregular church attendance, 2) divorce, 3) drinking alcoholic beverages, 4) use of tobacco, 5) card playing, 6) Sunday movies, 7) Sabbath labor, 8) young people loafing uptown, 9) young people staying out late, 10) failure in school, 11) ways young people spend their money, and 12) use of makeup. For descriptive purposes the last five items were classified as "youth items," the first seven as "general items." The youth items all dealt specifically with the behaviors of young people while the general items focused on social practices which applied predominantly to adults or to all age groupings. This classification was first employed by Wilson (1954) and later by Willits (1961) in their analyses of earlier data from the present project.

Each of the twelve items presented five response categories: strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree. Traditionalism was measured by assigning scores from one to five to the answers so that the higher the score, the more traditional or less liberal and permissive was the response. To obtain an indicator of the degree of traditionalism of the area, the mean scores for each

item for each of the schools were calculated using 1947 and 1970 data.

The amount of change in the normative climate was assessed by substracting the traditionalism score for 1947 from the 1970 score for each item for every school. These difference scores could range from -4 to +4 for any single question. Negative scores represented change from a more traditional toward a more liberal stance; positive scores reflected the reverse.

Measuring the Independent Variables: The Rural Context

To measure the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics designated as indicators of rurality, data were drawn from published census materials. The county was used as the data unit here for both theoretical and practical reasons. It was deemed to be sufficiently large to summarize the context or setting of the norms being studied and yet small enough to allow for local variations in the relevant characteristics. Accordingly, data were collected for 1950 and 1970 to measure variables believed to characterize rural areas.

One component of rurality recognized by most researchers is population size as indexed by the number of inhabitants in the relevant area. This variable is believed to provide some indication of the heterogeneity of the population and, when viewed in terms of change, areal growth and decline. Since population is, at least in some measure, a function of the size of the geographical unit, a measure of density (persons per square miles) was also examined as a possible independent variable.

Residential composition, a second component of rurality, was indexed by: 1) the percentage of the population classified as "urban" by the Census definition, and 2) the percentage of the population designated as "rural farm." The former measure focused on the degree to which the county's inhabitants lived in relatively large population centers; the latter dealt with the extent to which the population was associated with agricultural production. As such, the two measures emphasized different aspects of the residential composition idea.

The third independent variable set focused on the question of socioeconomic status (SES). Many writers have noted that historically there have been marked differences between rural and urban communities in regard to SES and the levels or standards of living of the population (Taylor, et al., 1949:297-304; Taylor and Jones, 1964:421). The social ranks of communities, like the social status of individuals, can be measured by income levels, educational attainment, and occupational composition (Shevky and Bell, 1955). Accordingly, three indices of county SES were initially examined for possible inclusion in this study: median family income; median school years completed for the population 25 years old and over; and the percentage of professional, technical, and kindred workers, (PTK) as well as managers officials, and proprietors (MOP) among the total labor forces of the communities. The last variable (percent of PTK-MOP) indicated the extent to which persons in the labor force of the county were engaged in upper status, white collar (nonmanual) occupations.

Median age of the county residents was the final indicator of rurality selected for possible use. While this measure does not assess the overall distribution among different age groups, it is a simple and useful variable for describing the complex phenomenon of age level of population. Historically, the age composition has been different for rural and urban sectors, with rural areas, because of their relatively high birth rates and larger families, having lower median ages than urban areas.

Since the independent variables chosen for analysis were all viewed as measures of "rurality," they might be expected to be interrelated. At the same time, the intention was to tap different aspects of this phenomenon and hence to arrive at measures which were complementary, but not identical. To ascertain the degree to which the various indices were interrelated, zero-order correlation were calculated for all possible pairs of these variables using 1950 and 1970 data, Table 1.

(Table 1 about here)

A number of the coefficients were large, indicating essential redundancy in the operational measures. Thus, population size and density had "correlations of .81 and .78 for 1950 and 1970 respectively. Similarly, "percent urban" and "percent rural farm" had r's of .84 and .66 for the two years.

For the three measures of socioeconomic status: median family income, median school years and percent PTK-MOP, all but one of the correlations were greater than .65. In addition, income and percent PTK-MOP were also highly correlated with population density and

percent of the population classified as rural farm. The high levels of these coefficients meant that there was considerable overlap of the actual operational measures. On the basis of these correlations, four of the eight indices were selected for use in the remainder of the study -- population density, percent rural farm, median years of schooling, and median age. These variables each had relatively high correlations with one or more of the deleted measures, but relatively low correlations with one another, Table 2. Hence they were taken as indicators of separate dimensions of rurality.

(Table 2 about here)

It was recognized that, of the four indices chosen, the first two represented more conventional measures of rurality than did the latter two. Population density and percent of the population classified as rural farm, index what have been termed the "ecological" and the "occupational" components of "rural" (Bealer, et al., 1965; Willits and Bealer, 1967). As such, these indicators can be taken to define the degree of rurality exhibited in an area. Socioeconomic status and age are more often seen as "correlates" of rurality, rather than as defining criteria. The concept of "rurality" (or its opposite "urbanism"), however, as proposed and interpreted by many social scientists (Sorokin, et al., 1930; Wirth, 1938; Bealer and Willits, 1967; and Fischer, 1973), is seen as consisting of multiple factors. Consequently, it was deemed appropriate to take into consideration all of these indicators, and to examine both their zero-order and combined effects.

Analysis

To ascertain the nature and degree of change in norms, the mean traditionalism scores for 1947 and 1970 for each of the twelve items were calculated. Paired t-tests, using the school at the unit of analysis, were used to determine the statistical significance of the differences, Table 3.

(Table 3 about here)

These data showed that there was a marked and consistent change from a more traditional to a more liberal or permissive position over the period studied. For all but one of the items (failure in school) the mean traditionalism scores declined significantly between 1947 and 1970. There was increasing acceptance of: irregular church attendance, divorce, drinking alcoholic beverages, use of tobacco, card playing, Sunday movies, Sabbath labor, and young people's loafing uptown, staying out late, ways of spending money, and the use of makeup. Such findings support the conclusion that rural areas, at least in Pennsylvania, have indeed become more permissive in their social norms and more accepting of many social practices once believed to be condemned.[2]

To ascertain the degree to which these alterations in traditionalism were associated with the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the areas, the variables measuring rurality were correlated with difference scores assessing normative change. At least two types of relationships seemed plausible. First, it was anticipated that those areas which had experienced the most rapid structural urbanization

would also be those which would show the greatest changes in norms during the period. Such an expectation was based on the systemic model of society which suggests that alteration in one aspect of the social order is transmitted throughout the system and effects other aspects of the society or culture. Thus, counties which have had the most change in terms of increasing population density, declining proportions of rural farm residents, and increasing median age and education would be expected to show the greatest change away from traditional norms. To measure change in urbanization, difference scores for each of the four independent variables were obtained by subtracting the 1950 value for the county from its corresponding 1970 value.

A second suggestion concerning the correlates of changing norms was that it is not the rapidity of urbanization occurring in the area that is most important in determining normative change. Rather, the initial level or degree of urbanization that exists is the more crucial variable, with urban areas likely to experience more rapid changes in norms, whether or not there are rapid concomitant changes in their structural characteristics. There is some research evidence that suggests this may be the case. Glenn and Simmons (1967), for example, in a study contrasting the changes in conservatism that have occurred in various regions of the United States, found that the South (the least urbanized region) had changed least rapidly in conservatism despite its relatively rapid changes in structural conditions of urbanization. The West and Northeast, both highly urbanized, but currently exhibiting slower structural change,

experienced greater change in conservatism. They concluded that, "the 'rate' of urbanization does not seem to be as important in bringing about cultural change as the 'degree' of urbanization" (page 192). If their conclusion is correct, then the 1950 levels population density, percent of the population classified as rural farm, median education, and median age should relate more closely to changes in the traditional norms that occurred between 1950 and 1970 than would the indicators of changes in urbanization.

To address this question, the 1950-70 change scores and the 1950 indicators of rurality were separately correlated with the change scores for the twelve traditionalism items. For this analysis, a control on the 1947 item score was introduced to allow for a more precise measure of normative change. Since the magnitude of the change was limited somewhat by the size of the initial attitude score, it was anticipated that the differences would be highly correlated with the 1947 scores. Examination of the data showed this to be the case, with correlations ranging from -.496 to -.896. Since interest in this section of the analysis focused on the relationships of the independent variables to change, rather than to level of traditionalism, the corresponding 1947 item score was incorporated as a control variable in each equation.

In general, the variables measuring the 1950 level of urbanization were more closely related to changes in the traditionalism scores than were those variables measuring changes in urbanization between 1950 and 1970, Table 4. This generalization was not true for the population density variables, where no consistent patterning of the differences was found. However, the magnitude of the correlation coefficients for

the relationships of median education, median age, and percent rural farm were, with few exceptions, larger for those variables measuring the initial level of rurality or urbanization than for those focusing on change in these characteristics. Moreover, the directions of the relationships between the levels of contextual rurality in 1950 and normative change were, in general, as expected. That is, if a community had a low initial level of rurality in its social context, as measured by low percent rural farm, high population density, high median age, and high median education in 1950, there would be greater decrease in its normative traditionalism. This finding contrasted with that from the analysis using the change in rurality measures as independent variables where change in percent rural farm was unexpectedly negative in its relationship to the traditionalism change scores. This latter relationship meant that those counties with the greatest decrease in the percent of the population classed as rural farm had the smallest decrease in traditionalism. Such a finding is difficult to interpret since it is completely contradictory to existing notions of rurality.

(Table 4 about here)

In an effort to explain the unexpected negative relationship between changes in percent rural farm and the traditionalism items and perhaps to clarify the meanings of the observed relationships the change indicators were re-examined by focusing on their possible interrelationships with the 1950 values. At the beginning of this section of the analysis, a control of the 1947 attitude item score had been introduced because it was established that the difference score measuring change in traditionalism was partially conditioned by the initial

item score. This was anticipated since the limited range of values for each item meant that the amount of change possible was an artifact of the change measure itself. The independent variables had not been expected to present the same difficulty since they possessed much wider ranges of possible scores. However, when the correlation coefficients for the relationships between the 1950 measures and the 1950-1970 change scores for each of the independent variables were calculated, it was found that, with the exception of median age, all of the correlations were statistically significant. This suggested that change in these factors, when dealt with in terms of the difference scores utilized in the previous analysis, actually focused not only on change but also on the initial level of the variables as well. In the case of the variable percent rural farm, the association between the 1950 scores and the change scores was so high ($r = -.958$) that the two measures could not be readily separated. However, since the 1950 score for the percent rural farm variable related in the expected direction to traditionalism, it seemed plausible to suggest that the unanticipated negative associations between the dependent variables and change in percent rural farm resulted solely from the latter's very high correlation with the 1950 measure.

To compare the predictive utility of the changes in urbanization with the initial level of urbanization for discussing areal differences in traditionalism, multiple partial correlation coefficients were calculated. These statistics allow for measuring that percentage of variation in the dependent variables which is associated with variation in a set of independent variables over and above what is

accounted for by another set of independent variables.[3]

The high levels of multicollinearity between the variables dealing with the 1950 percent of the population classified as rural farm and the 1950 to 1970 change in that percentage meant that these two variables could not both be meaningfully included in the equation since controlling on one meant essentially controlling the effect of the other. Consequently, multiple partials were calculated: 1) to measure the combined effect of the four 1950 contextual rurality indicators (percent rural farm, median age, median education, and population density), controlling for the three change variables (change in median age, change in median education, and change in population density) and 1947 item scores; and 2) to assess the combined relationship of the four change variables with the three 1950 level variables (excluding percent rural farm) together with the 1947 item scores controlled, Table 5.

(Table 5 about here)

For the general items, four of the seven relationships were statistically significant using the 1950 indicators of rurality. Only one general and one youth item were significantly associated with the 1950-70 change variables. Moreover, for <u>all</u> of the general items, the absolute values of the multiple partial coefficients were higher for the 1950 variables than for the 1950-70 change indicators. Differences between the corresponding coefficients using the youth items as dependent variables were smaller and less consistent.

Conclusions

One unambiguous substantive observation which emerges from the present data is that the traditionalism of rural areas has declined markedly over the last several decades. During the period from 1950 to 1970, norms became more permissive in regard to such aspects of general behavior as irregular church attendance, divorce, drinking, tobacco, card playing, Sunday movies, and Sabbath labor and toward such youth activities as spending money, staying out late, loafing uptown, and the use of makeup. This decline in traditionalism was least likely to occur in areas where the initial level of urbanization was low, regardless of the rapidity of change in the structural context. This suggests that differing degrees of urbanization are associated with differences in susceptibility to normative alteration. Such a conclusion is in accord with the conception of cities as the sources or centers of cultural change which then diffuses to the hinterland. It further suggests that, since those areas which are most rural tend to be the slowest to shift from traditional norms, the historical distinction between rural and urban culture may be expected to persist into the future. Clearly, continuing research is necessary if we would understand the causes of stability and change in norms across time.

Several suggestions arise from the present study that may warrant consideration in later studies. Longitudinal data are necessary to arrive at valid substantive conclusions concerning the concomitants of changing norms. The findings in the present paper could not have

been drawn from cross-sectional research, and, indeed, are not in accord with the inference based on such studies that the rapidity of change in the structural characteristics of an area leads to rapid change in norms and values.

Use of the county rather than the person as the unit of analysis in the present study underscored the possible utility of taking a sociological (in the traditional sense of the term) rather than a social psychological perspective. While such analysis has frequently been carried out using exclusively secondary data and focusing on demographic characteristics of the county, state, or region, the present study combined secondary materials with primary survey data assessing areal traditionalism. Research dealing with such cultural variables is not widespread, perhaps partly because of problems involved in operationalizing them. Use of the aggregation of individual responses to questions of what "should be permitted" provided a simple and straightforward measurement technique that may be useful in other research. This and other approaches to assessing cultural norms need to be further explored.

The measurement of change by the use of difference scores was associated with certain problems that future researchers need to consider. At least in the present study, these differences were highly correlated with the level of the initial (T_1) scores. This meant that controls on the T_1 measures were necessary to examine the "net" effects of change. Failure to call into account these interrelated variables could occasion misleading results.

Not all of the traditionalism measures related equally to the areal characteristics considered in this report. In general, those items dealing specifically with youth activities were associated less highly with the independent variables than were those focusing on more general behaviors. It was not evident just why this was the case. Perhaps ideas which are part of what could be termed "youth culture" are less geographically bound. Perhaps the wording of these items is such that they provide a more ambiguous stimulus and hence provide greater errors in measurement. Whatever the reason, the youth items did not relate to the areal variables examined here. Further longitudinal research using other samples and focusing on alternative indicators of the normative structure and rurality may provide additional insight into the nature of the relationships of these variables to one another.

FOOTNOTES

1. The term "norms" has also been used in sociology to refer to the "normal" or "typical" behavioral attitudes, or opinions of individuals in a group. Taken in this way norms refer to the modal pattern that does occur, rather than to the composite group expectation of what should ideally be found (Gould and Kolb, 1964:472-473). In this paper; however, the term norms will be used to refer to the "ought" or "should" dimension of group action. Assessment of the social or cultural norms of an area can be done in a number of different ways. Thus, for example, the anthropologist may characterize the normative stance in an area by observing the behavior of persons living there. Content analysis of the mass media output may be used to index norms. Individual members of the social unit may be asked to indicate what they consider to be the norms of the group in regard to specific areas of interest. The method chosen for use here was to aggregate the attitudes expressed by residents of the area concerning what should be permitted and/or not criticized. The use of such an indicator has some problems. Within any collectivity there is variation in the feelings of individual persons about just what "should" occur, and hence not everyone will express the normative stance of the area. However, in a democratic society one would expect that the actual community norms would not differ markedly from the dominant feelings of the individual members.

2. Previous analysis using the same survey data but focusing on the individual as the unit of analysis rather than the school, has been reported elsewhere (see, Willits, et al., 1973).

3. Concern here was not with the individual or net effects of the four separate rurality components as measured by beta coefficients or third order partial correlations. Rather, the focus of this analysis was on the combined utility of these indicators and hence on their cumulative effect on the dependent variables. This emphasis is in keeping with the perspective described earlier in this paper that, rurality consists of a composite of several characteristics and any assessment of the predictive utility of the concept requires a consideration of the combined effects of these components.

Bibliography

Anderson, N.
1962 "The urban way of life." International Journal of Comparative Sociology 3 (September):176-177.

Bealer, R.C., F.K. Willits, and W.P. Kuvlesky
1965 "The meaning of 'rurality' in American society: some implications of alternative definitions." Rural Sociology 30 (September):255-266.

Chand, I.P., D.M. Crider, and F.K. Willits
1975 "Parent-youth disagreement as perceived by youth: a longitudinal study." Youth and Society 6 (March):365-375.

Cole, W.E.
1958 Urban Society. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Copp, J.H.
1964 Our Changing Rural Society: Perspectives and Trends. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press.

Fischer, C.S.
1972 "Urbanism as a way of life: a review and an agenda." Sociological Methods and Research 1 (November):187-242.

Glenn, N.D. and J.L. Simmons
1967c "Are regional differences diminishing?" Public Opinion Quarterly 31 (Summer):176-193.

Gould, Julius and William L. Kolb
1964 A Dictionary of the Social Sciences. New York: The Free Press.

Grasmick, H.J.
1973 "Social change and modernism in the American South." American Behavioral Scientists 16 (July):913-933.

Larson, O.F. and E.M. Rogers
1964 "Rural society in transition: the American setting." In J.H. Copp (ed.), Changing Rural Society. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press.

Loomis, C.P. and J.A. Beegle
1950 Rural Social Systems. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Lowe, G.D. and C.W. Peek
1974 "Location and lifestyle: the comparative ability of urbanism and rurality." Rural Sociology 39 (September):392-420.

Poplin, D.E.
1972 Communities: A Survey of Theories and Methods of Research. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Rogers, E.M. and R.J. Burdge
1972 Social Change in Rural Societies. 2nd ed., New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Schuler, Edgar A. and Walter C. McKain Jr.
1949 "Levels and Standards of Living" in Rural Life in the United States by Carl C. Taylor, Douglas Ensminger, T. Wilson Longmore, Louis J. Ducoff, Arthur F. Raper, Margaret Jarman Hagood, Walter C. McKain Jr. and Edgar A. Schuler, Published by Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York.

Shevky, E. and W. Bell
1955 Social Area Analysis, Stanford; Stanford University Press.

Sorokin, P.A., C.C. Zimmerman and J.C. Galpin
1930 A Systematic Source Book in Rural Sociology: Volume I. Minnesota: The University of Minnesota Press.

Taheri, B.J. and F.K. Willits
1975 "Rurality and the normative order in a developing country." Rural Sociology 40 (Fall):251-267.

Taylor, Lee and Arthur R. Jones Jr.
1964 Rural Life and Urbanized Society, Oxford University Press, New York.

Van Es., J.C. and J.E. Brown Jr.
1974 "The rural-urban variable once more: some individual level observations." Rural Sociology 39 (September):373-391.

Vidich, A.J. and J. Bensman
1958 Small Town in Mass Society. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Williams, R.M. Jr.
1970 American Society (third edition). New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Willits, F.K.
1961 "Rurality and ecological patterns of dominance as related to levels of conservatism of Pennsylvania rural youth 1959-1960." Unpublished master's thesis. University Park, Penn.: The Pennsylvania State University.

Willits, F.K. and R.C. Bealer
1967 "An evaluation of a composite definition of 'rurality'." Rural Sociology 32 (June):165-177.

Willits, F.K., R.C. Bealer and D.M. Crider
1973 "Leveling of attitudes in mass society: rurality and traditional morality in America." Rural Sociology 38 (Spring):36-45.

1974 "The ecology of social traditionalism in a rural hinterland." Rural Sociology 39 (Fall):334-349.

Wilson, P.B.
1954 "Relationship between personal opinion and role expectancy for Pennsylvania rural youth 1947." Unpublished master's thesis. University Park, Penn.: The Pennsylvania State University.

Wirth, Louis
1938 "Urbanism as a way of life." American Journal of Sociology 44 (July):1-24.

Table 1. Zero order correlation coefficients for the relationships among the various indicators of rurality, 1950 and 1970.[a]

Variables	Population size	Population density	Percent urban population	Percent rural farm population	Median family income	Percent PTK-MOP	Median education	Median age
Population size	--	.785	.692	-.426	.571	.526	.236	.131
Population density	.815	--	.679	-.413	.652	.581	.284	.090
Percent urban population	.606	.661	--	-.655	.724	.661	.393	.164
Percent rural farm population	-.517	-.539	-.835	--	-.406	-.447	-.270	-.335
Median family income	.476	.630	.772	-.698	--	.797	.492	-.168
Percent PTK-MOP	.368	.625	.605	-.504	.698	--	.607	-.335
Median education	.189	.461	.412	-.252	.624	.799	--	-.377
Median age	.265	.317	.517	-.312	.471	.339	.262	--

[a]Figures above diagonal are for 1970; those below diagonal are for 1950.

Table 2. Zero order correlation coefficients among the selected independent variables, 1950 and 1970.[a]

Variables	Population Density	Percent Rural Farm	Median Education	Median Age
Population density	--	-.413	.284	.090
Percent rural farm	-.539	--	-.270	-.335
Median education	.461	-.252	--	-.377
Median age	.317	-.312	.262	--

[a]Numbers below the diagonal are for 1950, those above are for 1970.

Table 3. Paired t-tests for the significance of the differences in mean traditionalism scores, 1947 to 1970, N=68.

Traditionalism Items	1947 Mean Score	1970 Mean Score	t-value
General Items			
Church attendance	3.49	2.73	17.20***
Divorce	2.59	2.38	5.81***
Drinking	4.00	3.12	18.07***
Tobacco	3.46	3.31	2.59**
Card playing	2.77	2.30	12.86***
Sunday movies	3.11	2.29	13.80***
Sabbath labor	3.28	2.86	9.65***
Youth Items			
Loafing uptown	3.38	2.63	16.13***
Staying out late	2.94	2.49	8.41***
Failure in school	3.04	3.29	5.35***
Spending money	2.71	2.51	5.48***
Use of makeup	2.48	2.28	5.29***

**Significant .01
***Significant .001

Table 4. First order partial correlation coefficients for the relationships of 1950 socio-economic characteristics and changes in these characteristics to changes in traditionalism 1950-1970 with 1947 traditionalism score controlled, N=68.

Traditionalism Items	1950 % Rural Farm	1950 Median Age	1950 Median Educ.	1950 Pop. Density	Change % Rural Farm	Change Median Age	Change Median Educ.	Change Pop. Density
General Items								
Church attendance	.273*	-.447***	-.348**	-.300*	-.240*	.224	.004	-.332**
Divorce	.190	-.337**	-.168	-.126	-.137	.001	.070	-.186
Drinking	.392***	-.481***	-.332**	-.298*	-.339**	.137	.071	-.237
Tobacco	.318**	-.283*	-.221	-.273*	-.300*	.159	.095	-.301*
Card playing	.286*	-.304*	-.171	-.226	-.262*	.073	.067	-.098
Sunday movies	.412***	-.329**	.011	-.322*	-.372**	.008	-.041	-.293*
Sabbath labor	.238	-.331**	-.370**	-.370**	-.196	.239	.025	-.388***
Youth Items								
Loafing uptown	.403***	-.176	.014	-.268*	-.388***	-.166	-.007	.094
Staying out late	.257*	-.298*	-.304*	-.269*	-.204*	.359**	.036	-.395***
Failure in school	.218	-.161	.016	-.110	-.256*	-.137	.234	-.130
Spending money	.050	-.202	-.052	-.148	-.034	.089	.057	-.234
Use of makeup	.264*	-.151	-.151	-.269*	-.216	.112	-.148	-.211

*Significant .05
**Significant .01
***Significant .001

Table 5. Multiple partial correlation coefficients (r) and coefficients of determination (r^2) showing the combined effect of the four 1950 measures of contextual rurality with three change variables controlled, and the combined effect of four change variables with three 1950 measures controlled. (N=68)

Traditionalism Items	1950 Variables r^2	1950 Variables r	Change Variables r^2	Change Variables r	Difference in r^2
General Items					
Church attendance	.213	.462**	.070	.265	.143
Divorce	.114	.337	.031	.176	.083
Drinking	.309	.556**	.047	.216	.262
Tobacco	.111	.333	.065	.256	.046
Card playing	.164	.405**	.041	.202	.123
Sunday movies	.237	.487**	.179	.424*	.058
Sabbath labor	.129	.359	.067	.259	.062
Youth Items					
Loafing uptown	.126	.355	.094	.306	.032
Staying out late	.107	.327	.163	.403*	-.056
Failure in school	.080	.283	.122	.349	-.042
Spending money	.046	.216	.060	.245	-.014
Use of makeup	.063	.252	.119	.345	-.056

*Significant .05 level
**Significant .01 level